



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/781,889	02/12/2001	Sadahiko Yamaoka	1232-4684	1232-4684 9633	
27123 75	590 06/20/2006		EXAMINER		
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER			POND, ROBERT M		
	NY 10281-2101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ŕ			3625		
			DATE MAILED: 06/20/2000	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s) YAMAOKA ET AL.					
	09/781,889						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Robert M. Pond	3625					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence ac	Idress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value of the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a rep will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH, cause the application to become ABAI	ATION.  Iy be timely filed  IS from the mailing date of this condoned (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Ap	oril 2006.						
	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		rs, prosecution as to the	e merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15 and 21</u> is/are pending in the app	lication.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15 and 21</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		Mar Farming					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	•						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	` '					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			· ·				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached (	Office Action of form Pi	IO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul><li>12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li><li>a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:</li></ul>	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	eceived in this National	Stage				
application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not re	eceived.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· —	nmary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTC	D-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		,				

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.

Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 07 April 2006 has been entered.

### Response to Amendment

The Applicant previously canceled claim 16-20 and newly added claim 21. All pending claims (1-15 and 21) were examined in this non-final office action.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-15 and 21 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sanne (US 6,295,536).

Sanne teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 21. For example, Sanne discloses a system and method for users within a multi-organization to access electronic catalogs regardless of location. Sanne discloses the system routing catalog information to geographically and organizationally diverse users. Sanne discloses an enterprise organization comprising sub-unit organizations (e.g. Agency A through Agency Z) and each agency within the enterprise having an agency profile. Sanne discloses each user having a user profile (see at least title; abstract; Fig.1 (10a-f, 11a, 11z, 15, 16, 19a, 19z); col. 1, line 5 through col. 2, line 48). Sanne further discloses:

- Parts database storing parts information: (see at least col. 7, lines 26-57).
- First designating means for designating parts/material; searching and
   displaying; Inherent in Sanne are the structures permitting a first
   designating means for designating parts/material and displaying searched

Application/Control Number: 09/781,889

Art Unit: 3625

parts information. For example, Sanne discloses an example of data stored an agency database comprising a part description (i.e. computer), pricing, supplier identification data, etc (see at least col. 7, lines 26-57); searching and displaying using web browser user interface (see at least col. 4, lines 50-64; col. 5, lines 17-30).

- Pricing database: catalog pricing stored in Agency A database through Agency Z database (see at least Fig. 1(19a, 19z); Fig. 2B (24); Fig. 2C(24)).
- Inherent in Sanne are the structures permitting a second designating means for designating parts/material and displaying searched parts information. For example, Sanne discloses an example of data stored in any Agency A Agency Z database comprising a part description (i.e. computer), pricing, supplier identification data, etc (see at least col. 7, lines 26-57); searching and displaying using web browser user interface (see at least col. 4, lines 50-64; col. 5, lines 17-30).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject

Art Unit: 3625

matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanne (US 6,295,536) in view of Wiecha (US 5,870,717).

Sanne teaches all the above as noted under the 102(e) rejection and teaches a user accessing electronic catalogs within a multi-organizational enterprise regardless of location and organization (i.e. agency within an enterprise), and further teaches variations in local databases pertaining to supplier products and services, but does not specifically disclose displaying price difference control means for displaying a price difference between respective agency catalogs. Wiecha teaches procurement procedures in corporations of all sizes, making improvements by implementing one or more electronic catalogs for corporate users to access, and further teaches facilitating comparison of products between multiple suppliers and displaying differences between comparable items (see at least abstract; Fig. 6; col. 1, line 5 through col. 2, line 50; col. 3, lines 18-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention to modify the system of Sanne to provide pricing comparison/difference for comparable items as taught by Wiecha, in order to facilitate cost cutting by comparing comparable items sourced across multiple agencies within an enterprise. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefit of comparing comparable items across the enterprise.

Sanne teaches all the above as noted under the 103(a) rejection and teaches storing unit cost of an item associated with a pending purchase order, but does

Application/Control Number: 09/781,889

**Art Unit: 3625** 

not specifically disclose storing unit price history. Wiecha teaches all the above as noted under the 103(a) rejection and teaches browsing archive purchase order files and archiving multiple purchase order to multiple customer/vendor file systems (see at least col. 15, lines 46-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention to modify the system of Sanne to store purchase order history as taught by Wiecha, in order to maintain browsable archive of past purchase orders.

Page 6

**Art Unit: 3625** 

#### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Pond whose telephone number is 571-272-6760. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Mark Fadok can be reached on 571-272-6755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert M. Pond Primary Examiner June 16, 2006